UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,779	10/27/2000	Peter Michael Gits	2705-137	7155

20575 7590 12/12/2005

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER	
BATES, KEVIN T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/698,779	GITS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Bates	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/6/05
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on September 6, 2005.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 13, 14, 17, 20-23, 29-32, and 38-40 have been amended.

Claims 1-44 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 12-19, 22-28, 31-37, and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong (6356633) in view of Ben-Shachar (6209018).

Regarding claims 1 and 40, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent, comprising: a receiver designed to receive an object from a persistent store (Column 6, lines 44 – 53), the object independent of the message-processing agent (Column 6, lines 32 – 35); a default routing identifying a destination for the object (Column 6, lines 63 – 66); a wrapper remover designed to remove a wrapper from the object, a wrapper adder designed to add a new wrapper to the object (Column 8, lines 40 – 42); and a routing module designed to route the object to the destination (Column 7, lines 5 – 22)

wherein the message processing agent is operable in a system further including the persistent store (Column 6, lines 44 – 47) and the persistent store capable of having objects inserted into the store such that they do not lose their attributes (Column 6, lines 44 – 53) and of proving a notification service as the objects are inserted (Column 7, lines 60 – 63).

Armstrong teaches service modules and distributed agents operating the messaging service to handle the messages (Column 5, lines 46 – 49), but does indicate a service capable of cloning the message-processing agent.

Ben-Shachar teaches a distributed agent/object system (Column 5, lines 49 – 52) that includes cloning message service modules (workers) (Column 9, lines 12 – 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Ben-Shachar's teachings of distributed service processing in Armstrong's system in order to make the service fault tolerant (Column 7, lines 1 – 12; Column 9, lines 4 – 9).

Regarding claims 2 and 41, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 1 and 40, further comprising a user preferences setting that indicates a second destination for the object (Column 7, lines 5 – 22).

Regarding claim 3, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 2 and 4, wherein the second destination can be identical to the destination (Column 7, lines 5 – 22, where the objects can be auto-forwarded or it is determined that they can be held locally and processed).

Regarding claim 4, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claim 2, wherein the second destination can be different from the destination (Column 3, lines 64 – 66).

Regarding claims 5 and 42, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 2 and 41, wherein the user preference setting includes a plurality of distinct destinations for the object (Column 3, lines 64 – 66).

Regarding claim 12, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 1, wherein the message-processing agent further comprising a registration entry for a user (Column 5, lines 7 – 15; Column 7, lines 5 – 22).

Regarding claims 13, 22, and 31, Armstrong teaches a method for using a a message-processing agent, comprising: retrieving an object from a persistent store by the message-processing agent (Column 6, lines 44 – 53), the object independent of the message-processing agent (Column 6, lines 32 – 35); accessing a preference setting (Column 7, lines 5 – 22); removing a wrapper from the object, wrapping the object in a wrapper according to a destination for the object (Column 8, lines 40 – 42); and a routing module designed to route the object to the destination (Column 7, lines 5 – 22) wherein the message processing agent is operable in a system further including the persistent store (Column 6, lines 44 – 47) and the persistent store capable of having objects inserted into the store such that they do not lose their attributes (Column 6, lines 44 – 53) and of proving a notification service as the objects are inserted (Column 7, lines 60 – 63).

Armstrong teaches service modules and distributed agents operating the messaging service to handle the messages (Column 5, lines 46 – 49), but does indicate a service capable of cloning the message-processing agent.

Ben-Shachar teaches a distributed agent/object system (Column 5, lines 49 – 52) that includes cloning message service modules (workers) (Column 9, lines 12 – 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Ben-Shachar's teachings of distributed service processing in Armstrong's system in order to make the service fault tolerant (Column 7, lines 1 – 12; Column 9, lines 4 – 9).

Regarding claims 14, 23, and 32, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 13, 22, and 32, wherein retrieving an object includes receiving notice of the object from the persistent store (Column 7, lines 60 – 63).

Regarding claims 15, 24, and 33, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 13, 22, and 32, wherein accessing a preference setting includes selecting a preference setting according to an ultimate recipient of the object (Column 7, lines 5 – 22).

Regarding claims 16, 25, and 34, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 15, 24, and 33, wherein selecting a preference setting includes selecting a user preference setting according to the ultimate recipient if the user preference setting exists (Column 7, lines 5 – 22, if the proper keywords are found).

Regarding claims 17, 26, and 35, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 16, 25, and 34, wherein selecting a user preference setting includes checking to see if the ultimate recipient of the object is registered with the Scalable Infrastructure system (Column 6, lines 60 – 66).

Regarding claims 18, 27, and 36, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 15, 24, and 33, wherein selecting a preference setting includes selecting a default routing according to the ultimate recipient if no user preference setting exists (Column 7, lines 5 – 22, if the no proper keywords are found).

Regarding claim 19, 28, and 37, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 13, 22, and 32, wherein routing the object includes sending the object to a destination (Column 7, lines 5 – 22).

Claims 6-7, 10-12, 17, 20, 26, 29, 35, 38, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong in view of Ben-Shachar as applied to claims 1-5, 12-19, 22-28, 31-37, and 40-42 above, and further in view of Wolff (5327486).

Regarding claim 6, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claim 5.

Armstrong teaches a message handling working as a call center, but does not explicitly indicate that the message-processing agent is designed to route the object sequentially to each distinct destination for the object until the object is received at a first destination

Wolff teaches a call center that is designed to route the object sequentially to each distinct destination for the object until the object is received at a first destination (Column 2, lines 5 – 14).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Wolff's the teachings of a more advanced call center in Armstrong's email call centor in order to add additional features for the user of Armstrong's call center (Column 1, line 63 – Column 2, line 2).

Regarding claims 7 and 43, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 6 and 42.

Armstrong teaches a message handling working as a call center, but does not explicitly indicate that the message-processing agent is designed to place a second object in the space for a sequence agent to sequentially route the object to each distinct destination for the object until the object is received at the first destination.

Wolff teaches that the message-processing agent is designed to place a second object in the space for a sequence agent to sequentially route the object to each distinct destination for the object until the object is received at the first destination (Column 2, lines 5 – 14).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Wolff's the teachings of a more advanced call center in Armstrong's email call centor in order to add additional features for the user of Armstrong's call center (Column 1, line 63 – Column 2, line 2).

Regarding claim 10, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claim 2.

Armstrong teaches a message handling working as a call center, but does not explicitly indicate that the second destination includes routing instructions based on the source of the object.

Wolff teaches that the second destination includes routing instructions based on the source of the object (Column 2, lines 6 – 9).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Wolff's the teachings of a more advanced call center in Armstrong's email call centor in order to add additional features for the user of Armstrong's call center (Column 1, line 63 – Column 2, line 2).

Regarding claim 11, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claim 1.

Armstrong teaches a message handling working as a call center, but does not explicitly indicate that the first destination includes a telephone

Wolff teaches that the first destination includes a telephone (Column 3, line 66 – 68).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Wolff's the teachings of a more advanced call center in Armstrong's email call centor in order to add additional features for the user of Armstrong's call center (Column 1, line 63 – Column 2, line 2).

Regarding claims 20, 29, and 38, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 13, 22, and 31, wherein routing the object includes: determining at least two destinations for the object (Column 7, lines 5 – 22) and placing an object in the persistent store for routing (Column 6, lines 44 – 47).

Armstrong teaches a message handling working as a call center, but does not explicitly indicate that a sequence agent to sequentially route the object to each destination for the object until the object is received.

Wolff teaches a sequence agent to sequentially route the object to each destination for the object until the object is received (Column 2, lines 5 – 14, Wolff).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Wolff's the teachings of a more advanced call center in Armstrong's email call centor in order to add additional features for the user of Armstrong's call center (Column 1, line 63 – Column 2, line 2).

Claims 8, 9, 21, 30, 39, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong in view of Ben-Shachar as applied to claims 1-5, 12-19, 22-28, 31-37, and 40-42 above, and further in view of Wagner (6,092,102).

Regarding claims 8 and 44, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 5 and 42.

Armstrong does not explicitly mention that the message-processing agent is designed to broadcast the object to each distinct destination for the object until the object is received at a first destination.

Wagner teaches a messaging system and a message-processing agent (Column 6, lines 10 – 15) that designed to broadcast the object to each distinct destination (Column 6, lines 39 – 47) for the object until the object is received at a first destination (Column 14, lines 39 – 46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Wagner's teaching of message broadcasting on Armstrong's messaging system to be able to forward an at important email across many communication mediums and destinations (Column 3, lines 32 – 35).

Regarding claim 9, 21, 30, and 39, Armstrong teaches a message-processing agent according to claims 8, 13, 22, and 31, wherein routing the object includes: determining at least two destinations for the object (Column 7, lines 5 – 22) and placing an object in the persistent store for routing (Column 6, lines 44 – 47).

Armstrong does not explicitly indicate a broadcast agent to broadcast the object to each distinct destination for the object until the object is received at the first destination.

Wagner teaches a messaging system and a message-processing agent (Column 6, lines 10 – 15) that designed to broadcast the object to each distinct destination (Column 6, lines 39 – 47) for the object until the object is received at a first destination (Column 14, lines 39 – 46).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 5036535 issued to Gechter, because it discloses a call center with a plurality of agents.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
December 6, 2005

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER